<center>Remarks</center>

Claims 26-42 remain in the application for consideration of the Examiner with claims 1-25 standing canceled.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections are respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and following remarks.

Claims 26-42 were objected to because of informalities.

Claims 26-42 were amended to correct the informalities noted by the helpful comments of the examiner.

Claims 26-42 were rejected under 35 USC section 101.

The examiner alleges that the claims are not directed to an apparatus. However, amended claim 26 now recites a product user e-commerce screen of a computer.

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 26-42 are directed to an apparatus and are in full compliance with 35 USC section 101.

Claims 26-42 were rejected under 35 USC section 112 second paragraph.

The examiner alleges that claim 26 recites 'with or without' option variable questions by referring to the abstract. The specific language is not seen in claim 26, and should the examiner persist in this rejection, clarification is requested.

By the instant amendment, claims 13-25 have been canceled, and claims 26-42 have been submitted.

It is respectfully submitted that claims 26-42 are in full compliance with 35 USC section 112.

Claims 26 and 30-34 were rejected under 35 USC § 102 as being anticipated by Davidov. Claims 27-29 and 35-42 were rejected under 35 USC § 103 as being unpatentable over Davidov.

These rejections are respectively traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that Davidov does not disclose or suggest the presently claimed invention including the steps of determining if a XSD is present for the product and generating the option variable question only if the XSD is present.

There is nothing in Davidov to suggest the above mentioned steps.

Davidov discloses An infrastructure being provided for creating applications for mobile information devices, using a tag-based markup language. Developers can use the markup language to define applications and content based on easily manipulated textual tags, rather than having to write specific source code. A compiler processes the tags in several phases. In one phase, a hierarchical object model of the application is populated with objects. Then, in another phase, a generator traverses the object model hierarchy in a top-down manner, producing source code files corresponding to objects in the object model. The code files may include various elements, for example screens, forms, and servlets. For each element required to be generated, an appropriately configured generator class is invoked. The output code can be Java source code.

Davidov has nothing to do with products, e-commerce or a portal system.

Davidov relates to a conversion of an object model to a source file generation model

In light of the above amendment, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 26-42 are patently distinct.

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is respectfully submitted.

While it is believed that the instant response places the application in condition for allowance, and should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, it is requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned in order to expeditiously resolve any outstanding issues.

If the Examiner should have any questions, Applicant's legal representative can be contacted at 214-893-8886.

Respectfully submitted;

Wilson Daniel Swayze, Jr.
34,478
3804 Clearwater Court
Plano, Texas 75025